

Southern University where he earned a Bachelor of Science degree and later earned a Master's degree in economics in 1952.

His pinnacle academic achievement came when he earned a law degree from the Thurgood Marshall School of Law, at Texas Southern University.

This degree led him to blaze the trail and knock down doors for those of us who would follow. His law degree allowed him to become an Assistant U.S. Attorney appointed by Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy. Marking yet another first, Judge Walker was the first African-American U.S. Attorney for the Southern District of Texas.

When not busy upholding the law, the Honorable Carl Walker, Jr. was involved in a number of civic and religious organizations in Houston, Texas.

He held positions with the Civic League, Eldorado Social Club, and the South Central YMCA Board of Managers. Mr. Walker served as President of the Harris County Council of Organizations, the Houston Chapter of the U.S.O., the Texas Southern University Alumni and Ex-Students Associations, and the Houston Business and Professional Men's Club. He also served on the board of directors of the American Red Cross.

He had a number of professional affiliations including the United States Supreme Court, the Houston Bar Association, the State Bar of Texas, the Texas Bar Foundation, the United States Tax Court, Federal Bar Association, Fifth Circuit of Appeals, and the Texas Judicial Association.

I was humbled by an invitation to give a special tribute to Carl Walker, Jr. at his passing. I hold our men and women who have used their lives to better our country in the highest regard and take great pride in commemorating the extraordinary life of the Honorable Carl Walker Jr. It is because of Carl Walker's good works that not only the Congressional District but all of Houston and America could have an improved quality of life. He was a tremendous moral force who will be sorely missed as we look to his example in the struggle for justice and integrity in our country today.

#### A BILL FOR EXTERNAL REGULATION OF NUCLEAR SAFETY AND OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH AT DOE

**HON. JERRY F. COSTELLO**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, July 26, 2002*

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a bill that provides for the external regulation of nuclear safety and occupational safety and health at the Department of Energy civilian laboratories. This bill, which draws from the work of my friends and colleagues Congressman TIM ROEMER, Congressman KEN CALVERT and former Congressman TOM BLILEY, would push the Department of Energy to take a step that virtually everyone agrees is overdue: get the Department of Energy out of the business of regulating itself in the areas of nuclear and worker safety.

Discussion of external regulation at the labs is an old idea. It received an official boost in 1993 when then Secretary of Energy Hazel

O'Leary announced that she would seek to implement external regulation of worker safety. Then, in 1994, legislation was introduced forcing DOE to stop self regulating their nuclear facilities. DOE responded to these legislative initiatives by launching advisory groups to lay out a path to external regulation. In 1996, DOE embraced a ten-year plan to implement external regulation.

For many outside of the Department, this ten-year plan appeared too cautious. However, to those in the Department, it appeared too ambitious. In 1997, then Secretary Pena decided to take a step away from that commitment and run a 2-year pilot program to determine the costs and benefits of external regulation. With the end of that pilot program, Secretary Pena's successor, Secretary Richardson, decided that external regulation would be unworkable.

Curiously, the two participating regulatory agencies involved in the pilot came to a very different conclusion. Both the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) and the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) concluded the pilot to have been successful. I was the ranking member on the Energy Subcommittee of the Science Committee when the pilot was completed and we had an elaborate hearing on this issue. I came away convinced that while there were some questions about implementation, the overwhelming evidence was that external regulation would provide more safety to workers and communities near labs while allowing the labs themselves to focus more on the science and technology.

It is for this reason that laboratory managers also favor external regulation. They believe that external regulation would free up overhead costs involved in self-regulation and allow them to redirect resources towards doing more science. From the labs' perspectives DOE is an inconstant regulator with changes in standards, reporting requirements, and interventions. The NRC and OSHA are both professional regulatory bodies that provide a clearer regulatory regime with significant cost savings to those subject to their regulatory guidance.

Recently, the Energy and Water Appropriations Subcommittee here in the House has taken a leading role in pushing the Department towards external regulation. Yet, the Department continues to resist external regulation. Just yesterday, the Energy Subcommittee of Science held a hearing in which the Director of the Office of Science said they are moving towards another study of external regulation. They are planning an elaborate study involving OSHA and NRC with preliminary results due next year. After nine years of studying this issue, we already know that external regulation is the right answer; yet, DOE insists that another study is needed.

There is a consensus everywhere outside of DOE that the labs should be subject to external regulation. GAO holds that position. The Labs hold that position. The potential regulators hold that position. I believe the workers, the communities near the labs and the taxpayers all deserve to see this happen sooner rather than later. As a Member of the Science Committee—an authorizing Committee of jurisdiction—this bill is intended as another signal to DOE that foot-dragging and endless studies will not satisfy this Congress.

#### H.R. 3763, THE CORPORATE AND AUDITING ACCOUNTABILITY AND RESPONSIBILITY ACT

SPEECH OF

**HON. TOM UDALL**

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, July 25, 2002*

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Conference Report on H.R. 3763. I would like to commend the hard work of the conferees on this critically important legislation. The recent string of accounting scandals has badly damaged the confidence of many Americans in our nation's corporations and markets. This legislation is a strong step toward restoring their confidence and stabilizing our nation's economy.

It seems like every day we hear a new story of executives who misled their investors and their workers and stole millions of dollars. These executives are called irresponsible; they are accused of mismanagement or unorthodox business practices. But these corporate leaders aren't unorthodox; they are criminals, plain and simple. They have stolen more money than any thieves I've ever heard of, and their crimes have real victims.

The victims of these corporate crimes are workers, like the workers at Enron who just wanted an honest job with a fair expectation of job security. For all their hard work, these workers got 10 minutes to clear out their desks. In some cases they were even denied their severance packages if they refused to sign documents giving up the right to sue Enron for defrauding them. Defrauding workers and forcing them to give up their legal rights isn't irresponsibility; it is a crime.

Even workers who never had anything to do with Enron were hurt by the collapse of that company. As Enron declared bankruptcy, public employees in 30 states lost anywhere from \$1.5 billion to \$10 billion from their pension plans. Stealing money from public employee pension plans is not irresponsibility; it is a crime.

Even those of us who had absolutely nothing to do with the Enrons or Worldcoms of the world are hurt by corporate crime. The unethical behavior of the executives at Worldcom, which was recently forced to admit it had invented \$3.8 billion in earnings, has had a devastating effect on that company's stock price. But the stock market as a whole has also suffered from the lack of confidence created by widespread corporate abuse. Less than 3 percent of all publicly traded companies misstate their earnings, but this small group casts doubt on the statements of other, more ethical businesses.

A free-market system cannot function if investors do not trust executives, and therefore the crimes of Worldcom and Enron are crimes not only against their stockholders, but against the very system that allowed these companies to flourish.

Even after the collapse of Enron and the exposure of billions in fake earnings at Worldcom, many in Congress were working to protect their corporate patrons from any real accountability. The initial House-passed version of this legislation, sponsored by Mr. OXLEY, did nothing to protect against corporate abuse and bring back public confidence in corporate governance. In some cases, the